THE NEW ENGLAND SOCIAL STUDIES BULLETIN

Volume VII, Number 1 October, 1949

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor—COLIN F. N. IRVING
Business Editor—FELIX V. CUTLER

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL EDWARD H. MERRILL
CHESTER M. DESTLER HOWARD C. OLSEN
A. IMRIE DIXON ISABELLA M. STEPHENS
HOWARD P. JOHNSON ELSIE E. WHITNEY
WILLIAM H. CARTWRIGHT, *ex-officio*

Corresponding Editors

RUTH O. M. ANDERSON ..... *Norwich Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.*
ANNA C. HAWTHORNE .... *Nathanael Greene Junior High, Providence, R. I.*
ELIZABETH HALE ..... *State Teachers College, Castleton, Vt.*
ROBERT MCKINNEY ..... *Plymouth Teachers College, Plymouth, N. H.*
CLINTON F. THURLOW ..... *Cony High School, Augusta, Me.*

We take pleasure in announcing the appointment of Howard C. Olsen of the East Providence Senior High School and Mrs. Rockwell R. Stephens of Wellesley College as members of our Editorial Board.

Subscription $1.00 per year

Distributed free to members of
The New England Association of Social Studies Teachers.

Address editorial correspondence to: Colin F. N. Irving, Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H.; business correspondence to Felix V. Cutler, Quincy High School, Quincy, Mass.

THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

President,
William H. Cartwright, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Vice-President,
Chester M. Destler, Connecticut College, New London, Conn.
Secretary-Treasurer,
Richard T. Flood, Noble and Greenough School, Dedham, Mass.
Executive Committee:

Term expires March, 1950

Ronald C. Beasley, Groton School, Groton, Mass.
Jane E. McCabe, Brookline High School, Brookline, Mass.
Wendell F. Smith, Brookline High School, Brookline, Mass.
Wilson C. Colvin, *ex-officio*, John Weeks Junior High School, Newton, Mass.

Term expires March, 1951

Mary R. Godfrey, Memorial Avenue School, West Springfield, Mass.
Catherine N. Nevius, Walnut Hill School, Natick, Mass.
Rev. Timothy F. O'Leary, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Boston, Mass.

Term expires March, 1952

Walter F. Barnes, Wheelock College, Boston, Mass.
Valeria A. Knapp, Winsor School, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Verna C. Powell, Colby Junior College, New London, N. H.

EDITORIAL

A few years ago THE BULLETIN carried a department known as "Something For Nothing." It occurs to us upon stopping and taking stock of this magazine and the society which it represents that this phrase might well epitomize the advantages which the N.E.A.S.S.T. has to offer. How many of us when the little white slip which notifies us that another year's dues is owing arrives, place it carefully in the back of our letter files and permit its existence to slip gently from our minds?

Would we treat an insurance premium notice or a bill for $100 in such a cavalier fashion? But somehow a bill for one dollar seems too small, the effort of making out a check for that amount is too great. Perhaps some of us ask ourselves in a hard-headed fashion, "Just what do I get out of it, what is there in it for me?"

For his one dollar bill the social studies teacher gets three things. First of all he enjoys the sense of professional pride and distinction which comes from belonging to a society which embraces many of his colleagues throughout New England. Secondly, he is privileged to meet in fellowship with them three times a year, exchange ideas, and contribute directly to the course of the society and the substance of the ideals he believes it should represent.

Thirdly, in terms of cold cash he receives through THE BULLETIN a one hundred per cent return on his initial investment. The cost of printing and mailing the magazine amounts to about two dollars per member, only part of which is met through advertising.

An alert and active membership is the life blood of any professional organization. As our society grows, so also will increase its value and service to all of us. So the next time you receive your annual note from the Secretary-Treasurer don't bury it under the nearest pile of uncorrected papers, but think for a moment of the returns which your dollar bill brings you. In a world of rising prices good investments are perhaps becoming scarcer, but we hope that this is one prospectus which will prove persuasive. Indeed it seems to us that all of our members have been getting "Something For Nothing."

Probably few members of this society ever meet an editor of THE BULLETIN in person. Perhaps he is only the fellow to whom other people send manuscripts. Yet for two years Phillips E. Wilson has been good-naturedly pumping the teaching profession of New England for articles and wrestling with the enigmas of type fonts and page proofs. Eight times under his aegis our slim red volume has emerged, always displaying a freshness and a zest which has done honor to the society. It is fitting, therefore, that all of us at this time should think of "Phil" and express our gratitude for a job done with skill and discernment. He has established a high standard at which the new staff may set its sights.

C. I.

PALMER HOWARD

Since our last issue the sad news has come of the death of Palmer Howard, Hartford, Connecticut. Mr. Howard had long been a member of our Association, had served on committees and had been a most active and helpful member of the Executive Board. He was doing distinguished work for the state as coordinator of a Progressive Citizenship program. We shall all remember him as a quiet, scholarly, friendly man who always had time to discuss professional problems. The profession has lost a leader and we have lost a friend.

E. E. W.

THE NEA MEETING: TWO ASPECTS OF CIVIC EDUCATION

CHARLES PELTIER,
Newton Senior High School.

Civic education has not been completely neglected in the United States, but it is still an important area in which comparatively little has been done. This is especially noteworthy with reference to research at the university level and with reference to the influence of civic education objectives, materials and methods in the schools themselves. At the same time, grants of money within the last few years have made it possible for several studies, of varying magnitude, to be undertaken. One of the most promising of these is the Civic Education Project in Cambridge, Mass.

It is, therefore, to be expected that members of the New England Association of Social Studies Teachers would wish to talk over various aspects of educating our youth for better living together in the democratic way with National Education Association delegates from all parts of the United States. Civic education was made the topic for discussion at the meeting of members of the N.E.A. and the N.E.A.S.S.T. at Boston University School of Education on July 4, 1949.

President William H. Cartwright of the New England Association preside, introducing the speakers and leading the discussion. Speakers were Lewis Paul Todd, editor of *Social Education*, and Mildred H. Mahoney, chairman of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission. W. Linwood Chase, Professor of Education in Boston University, and a past-president of the National Council for the Social Studies, acted as discussant. John J. Mahoney, Boston University Professor Emeritus and Co-director of the Civic Education Project, was scheduled to speak but was unable to be present.

Civic education, according to Mr. Todd, has two aspects. One is that of teaching children to work well together in face-to-face groups. Here, he said, we have done a good job. The second aspect is the informational. Children should know what is happening in their own communities and in the world outside — and what they can do about it.

This speaker raised the related questions, "Are our children learning enough facts?", and, "Aren't we in danger of superficiality?" He pointed out that many good textbooks are available and should be used. Many of the needed facts are obtained through vicarious experience, through books. Mr. Todd endorsed adapting a curriculum to the needs of a community but indicated that he did not believe that we as teachers are qualified to write a course in United States History or in World History. That more cooperation is needed between social studies teachers and social scientists was also stressed by the speaker. Finally, again with reference to the whole question of the importance of content, Mr. Todd pointed out that on the basis of materials offered to *Social Education*, teachers are more concerned with how to teach than with what to teach.

Mrs. Mahoney, speaking for her husband, explained the Civic Education Project. First, however, she made three points of great importance to an understanding of civic education as conceived by the author of *For Us the Living*. The first of these is that civic education is not a course. This is based on Mr. Mahoney's experience with teachers who tend to confuse civic education with civics, and therefore assume that since their school offers civics, education for citizenship is being performed satisfactorily.

Her second point was that civic education is not the job of social studies teachers alone. This grows out of the assumption that this particular "edu-

cation" is the responsibility of administrators and of all teachers of all grades and all subjects, and must be planned *purposively* in terms of a comprehensive program for all grades, all subjects (content and method), the extra-curriculum, and the administrative and supervisory procedures of a school system.

Next, Mrs. Mahoney stressed, as a third point, the importance of education for better *societal* relations. We have done well in the face-to-face-relations phase of education but much remains to be done in educating for better large-group relationships. Both her civic education background and her experience with F.E.P.C. lend considerable support to the speaker's point of view here.

Mrs. Mahoney then went on to outline the organization and work of the Civic Education Project, which has just completed the first year of its planned three-year program, working in Walker House at Harvard University. Purposes of the project include collecting, examining, and arranging materials useful in developing civic intelligence and civic responsibility, and fashioning a program for the schools which will help them in preparing youth for citizenship in a democracy — thus making a contribution to a consistent and effective movement for a national program of civic education.

The project is directed by Henry W. Holmes, former Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Mr. Mahoney. The directors have planned to devote the first two years of the project to working with a Study Group of experienced and superior teachers. This group, for the academic year, 1948-49, included the following persons: Doris Boyd, on leave as teacher of English and Dean of Girls, Beverly High School; Charles C. Buell, on leave as head of the Department of Public Affairs, St. Paul's School; Jane A. McCabe, on leave as teacher of Community Civics, Brookline High School; May E. Milliken, on leave as teacher of history and problems, Gamaliel Bradford High School; Francis X. Molloney, on leave as head of the Department of Social Studies, Brighton High School. Kenneth Sheldon, on leave as Professor of Social Studies, Sargent College, Boston University, is serving as executive officer for the project.

The materials, as produced by the Study Group will be submitted to consultants and then to school students. Revisions will be made and the process repeated. Roy A. Price has been engaged to serve as consultant for the life of the project. Others who have aided in the role of consultants are Roy O. Billett, W. Linwood Chase, and William H. Cartwright, Boston University School of Education, Ethel Alpenfels, Bureau for Intercultural Education, John Bibaut, National Municipal League, Stanley Dimond, Detroit and Wayne University Citizenship Education Study, Paul Elicker, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Erling Hunt, Teachers College, Mary Kelty National Council for the Social Studies, Louis Lyons, Harvard University, and Dorothy McClure, U. S. Office of Education. After appraisal based on the opinions of consultants and other experts and on the results of using the materials in school classes, the materials are to be published booklet and pamphlet form.

Funds for their project and responsibility for their expenditure, as well as general oversight of the project are in the hands of the Educational Research Corporation of Cambridge, Massachusetts. Directors of the Corporation are Truman L. Kelley, Philip J. Rulon, Leonard Carmichael, Bancroft Beatley, Jesse B. Davis, Kirtley F. Mather, Henry W. Holmes, and John J. Mahoney.

THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST IN THE CLASS ROOM

ISABELLA M. STEPHENS,
Wellesley College.

In the years between the two world wars, teachers of history and social studies in American schools made some serious mistakes. Many teachers priding themselves on being well-informed and free from the influences of propaganda fell in with the idea that the United States was well out of a bad mess when we refused to be a party to the Treaty of Versailles and refused to join the League of Nations. They encouraged their pupils in a kind of unrealistic isolationism which was to reach its peak in 1939 in the "Veterans of Future Wars" organization. The strongly naive skepticism which led young people to say, "Its all propaganda" whenever they did not want to believe anything they read or heard was at least in part the result of up-to-date high school courses in "Propaganda Analysis" and "Current Problems." In many schools pupils were not encouraged to discover what was admirable and worthy of their vigorous support. Rather, they were taught to be smartly scornful. Their only strong convictions often seemed to be that strong convictions were silly. "It's only a matter of opinion" and "Who is to say what is right?" "It depends on your point of view," were popular remarks to make when the significance of world events was discussed.

The consequences of these tragic errors on the part of well-intentioned school teachers was only too obvious in the years between 1935 and 1941. Many people under twenty-five, college students among them, were more muddled in their thinking than they could possibly have been without the efforts of muddled teachers. They continued to be smartly skeptical, refusing to believe the accurate accounts coming out of Germany and Spain from reliable reporters. Some clung to an oversimplified pacifist doctrine which was merely a selfish isolationism and withdrawal from responsibility in world affairs. Others abdicated from responsibility by saying, "How do you know that Hitler is wrong? Maybe we just think our way is best and after all he is right." When the attack on Pearl Harbor came, these young people were in the miserable position of being wholly unprepared to understand the struggle they were caught in. Had they been less cleverly and more wisely taught at school, they might have seen and understood the issues at stake in Manchuria. Ethopia, and the Spanish Civil War. They might have expressed horror, rather than incredulity over the story of the rise of Hitler.

One of the important lessons to be learned from the last twenty-five years is that school teachers would be wise to teach history and current events with emphasis on the facts and the truth rather than on falsehood and propaganda. Debunking can be much overdone. When pupils have been helped to discover what civilization is, they will be quick enough to discover what threatens it. When they are taught to be critical before they develop judgment, they are pathetic and dangerous.

World War II cured many school teachers of their tendency to debunk and to undermine convictions ruthlessly. Ethical relativism of the kind most common twenty years ago among young school teachers is much less in evidence, but it has by no means disappeared. Cynicism is easy. (There will be a new supply of debunking books to "prove" that American participation in the last war was avoidable, that it was all a hoax pulled off against the interests of a peace-loving people by clever business interests and ambitious politicians.)

This danger moves out, only to make room for other dangers. One of

these is, at this moment, seeping down from the graduate schools into the lower brackets of education. Of recent years the study of cultural anthropology and social psychology have made great advances. Students majoring in the social sciences are usually well-rounded in studies in comparative cultures. Most of them have come to realize the tremendous influence of patterns of culture upon national and individual characteristics and have, therefore, come to look upon human beings merely as the conditioned products of the particular culture into which they happen to have been born. There is, of course, nothing against inquiring into the way in which people are shaped by their particular culture. In fact, the inquiry often marks a great step forward in the scholarly study of some aspects of human development. But what may happen when the enthusiastic young man, just out of graduate school begins teaching social studies from texts written by equally enthusiastic disciples of the newest social sciences? It is a bit early to make any general predictions, but anyone who has been on university campuses in the past few years will recognize the young graduate eager to drive home the idea that all men are creatures of their particular culture and that, therefore, all men are products of a particular set of values which they have acquired by dint of adjusting well to their own culture and behaving in ways acceptable in that culture. As individuals, he believes, men are quite helpless in any search for right or wrong or any search for truth outside the boundaries of "empirical science." No truth can be discovered about one's self or one's fellows unless they are "'scientific truths." All other knowledge is colored by one's cultural heritage, so that one likes what one is conditioned to think is good, or thinks good what one has been conditioned to like.

According to this view, all the words that make up the vocabulary traditionally used in describing responsible action are empty of meaning. Freedom becomes no more than a word which is used in the expression of conditioned response in a culture that has developed around the myth of freedom, and all intelligent people know that freedom is just a pleasant word used to describe certain patterns of behavior which are gratifying to people who have been conditioned to life in some western cultures. Freedom has no reality since all men are, in fact, (demonstrably) slaves to their reactions and responses to stimuli which are patterned and to which there are acceptable and unacceptable responses in every culture. The person who thinks he is making a choice is, in fact, merely going through the forms of response. The action he finally takes is the only one he could have taken since he has been conditioned since earliest childhood to be the person he is. There is no good action or bad action, there is only action acceptable in one's culture and action not acceptable in one's culture. Who is to say which culture is best? Who is to deny the power of his own culture or try to assert that he himself has discovered what is in fact good, what bad?

Out of this hodge-podge of part truths, whole truths and falsehoods comes a deep confusion. Right in the middle of a discussion of tolerance or free speech or equality of opportunity or any other democratic principle, the earnest young teacher may find himself saying to himself, "Dear, dear, of course all this is just cultural. I am just conditioning my pupils to think that free speech is good. Other cultures do not allow free speech, yet they persist and prosper. Among the Boogy-Boogies of Allapop Island there is not free speech, yet they are very happy. Perhaps we just think all this important. That does not make its importance a scientific fact. The only fact is that we have been brought up to think free speech is important." Perhaps it is not surprising that this teacher finds it hard to be a convincing leader in his own classroom. It is not too hard to see why he likes to stick to "scientific facts."

In his college days, he might have written the following statement, actually written by an intelligent college student in November, 1941:

> "I have just read 'Education for Death' and while I, as an individual, am mildly shocked at the picture it presents, one thing bothers me. How can we say that Hitler is wrong? Naturally his methods are entirely different from any we would wish to impose upon ourselves. But didn't people think likewise at the time of the American and French Revolutions and at the time of any great change or upheaval from the accepted way of the world? Yet weren't all these idiosyncracies of a single group of people the very things that we say have made the world a better place in which to live?
>
> "According to Hitler, the party is not interested in the individual but in the race, which is the bigger unit. Being a science major, I, too, have often wondered whether it is more important to sacrifice the state or the individual. Will a country whch favors individual achievement and thought surpass that where the state is a unit? Will smothering the individual for the sake of the state produce more common good, or will it also smother the ideas of what is good? Can the state or anyone know what is good for the individual? Yet if the individual were sacrificed and those who were considered best (here we would have to define 'best') were chosen, would not a better race be produced and consequently a better individual? This would, of course, be an endless process. I frankly have no idea as to which is the better. Much can be said for both sides, but as yet the 'happy medium' has not been struck. The individual with a consciousness of the state is something to work for.
>
> "Hitler in his educational system has gone back to the scientific mode of rule of which one may approve or not. It has its advantages from his point of view and I have heard many others with the same viewpoint."

It is difficult to make any comment on this brief essay without launching into a long discussion of the kinds of confusions it indicates. Perhaps it can stand by itself as an evidence of the dangers of naive ideas of what is "scientific." It certainly seems to show what may happen when students are encouraged to study human beings as if they were complicated rats in a maze. This is easier than it is to teach about them as responsible and ideal-seeking persons. To make one emphasis without the other is to distort the study of mankind. It encourages students to talk about the "happy medium" between freedom and slavery without any idea of what either means — until it is too late perhaps.

Another tendency which is already quite apparent, of course, is one which the fiasco of the election polls has made somewhat obvious to everyone. This is the tendency to claim as scientific, studies which are not scientific in any sense of the word that is at all generally accepted. In their enthusiasm for a science of mankind, many young teachers may exaggerate the finding of "sociometrics." There is among them a strange inclination to talk as if it were possible to measure all sorts of things that cannot be measured. Because they may have read monographs on "The Prediction of Personal Adjustment" while in graduate school, they will talk as if it were actually possible to tell a young engaged couple what their chances of happiness are within a small plus or minus range. Because they know the word demonology, they will talk as if human populations behave as predictably as rabbits. Such talk is misleading in ways they themselves do not fully realize. While trying quite sincerely to help their pupils to think accurately and scientifi-

cally, they in fact help to build up a whole new mythology about the infallibility of prediction about human action. A nationwide election may explode some myths. At other times it is more difficult to see the fallacies.

Experienced teachers of social studies in our high schools may have to take upon themselves not only the task of revising and improving their own teaching if young people are to understand the essentials of active citizenship in a free society. They may have to watch rather critically the doctrines being expounded by newer teachers. No one would advocate an attempt to gag the bright products of graduate schools, tempting as such an undemocratic solution sometimes seems. Nevertheless, they may need advice and suggestions to cure them of a kind of blind faith in "social science" which is in its way as dangerous as any other kind of blindness. It is discouraging to think that the next generation might be as steeped in the statistician's view of the world as the previous generation was in the debunker's view of the world.

It would be comforting to be able to believe that school children in the fifties will be helped to see their world by teachers who know what freedom means and, therefore, who understand something of the meaning of the crisis facing western civilization. The struggle between a statistical view of mankind and a moral view of mankind is the essential conflict of the present day. It is in full swing now. At the extreme (right and left) executing a pincers movement on democracy are the people who deny the sacrosanct individual and make people into dots in a graph. In the middle, along with everybody else, are the people who know that a free society is a good society worth working toward and that a free society recognizes every person as a responsible being. Of course, a person is in part conditioned by his culture, but if he cannot choose between right and wrong, he cannot be free. Then Marx is right that history is an inexorable force dragging man on his predestined way.

In this present struggle there can be no Pearl Harbor to crystallize public opinion so that young people can take a stand without understanding at all what the issues are. It would be comforting to believe that social teachers of the future will see this, but the evidence does not seem to point at all clearly in that direction.

MEMBERSHIP DUES

N. E. A. S. S. T. Junior Membership (Students) . .	$ .50
N. E. A. S. S. T. Active Membership	1.00
N. E. A. S. S. T. Sustaining Membership	3.00
National Council Membership	4.00

For Joint Membership in N. E. A. S. S. T. and National Council add $3.75 to your N. E. A. S. S. T. membership fee. This includes subscriptions to THE BULLETIN and to *Social Education*.

Make checks payable to New England Association of Social Studies Teachers and send to the Treasurer, Richard T. Flood, Noble and Greenough School, Dedham, Mass.

Membership runs for a calendar year from date fee is paid

LINCOLN'S GOOD-WILL AMBASSADORS

AUGUST C. MILLER, JR.,
Northeastern University.

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Professor Miller's article is reprinted in condensed version from the Lincoln Herald, a quarterly publication of the Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn. The original article appeared in the issue of June, 1948.*

European opinion was very definitely one of the significant factors in the outcome of the American Civil War. At his first cabinet meeting on March 5, 1861, President Lincoln heard how intervention by Great Britain or France could establish the Confederacy. Lincoln was slow to think, but devastatingly logical and practical; and as the war moved along it became increasingly evident to him that the "favor or disfavor of foreign nations might have a material influence in enlarging or prolonging the struggle." In England and France public opinion was to exert itself in foreign policy as never before in European history: the moulding of this opinion during the war was partly the work of voluntary propagandists on behalf of the union cause and partly the inevitable product of the ups and downs of war.

The accredited officials of the diplomatic and consular service though interested in "acting on the public mind" were restricted by their recognized offices and protocol. This was especially true of the American legation in London, where no systematic attempt was made to influence British channels of information. In order to set right the Union cause in all important circles of influence it was therefore in "October, 1861 . . . deemed important by the administration that some gentlemen of intelligence and experience, possessing a good knowledge of the circumstances which preceded and occasioned the Rebellion, should be sent abroad to disabuse the public mind, especially in England and France, where numerous and active agents of secession and rebellion had long been at work . . ."

In early November, 1861, Thurlow Weed. veteran journalist and boss politician of New York state, along with Bishop McIlvaine, Episcopalian of Ohio, and Archbishop John Hughes, Catholic of New York, were sent abroad by Secretary Seward as semi-official diplomats. Included also in the party was General Winfield Scott, who had resigned from the Army and who had been invited to act with the commission. It was intended that Mr. Weed labor with journalists and public leaders in order to counteract the Confederate journalistic enterprise abroad; Bishop McIlvaine was to make his appeal to the English clergy; Archbishop Hughes was to bring the Papacy, Emperor Napoleon, and other Catholic rulers to a correct understanding of the causes and purposes of the Civil War.

Shortly after the American envoys arrived in France news of the *Trent* affair reached England and France, and caused wild excitement throughout both countries. In a meeting with William L. Dayton, minister to France, Henry S. Sanford, minister to Belgium, and John Bigelow, consul-general at Paris, Weed agreed that it was most important that a letter of "public assurance" appear immediately in French and English journals. Through Weed's conniving the letter was actually written by Bigelow, an expert in diplomatic correspondence, but carried Scott's bold signature. Copies of the letter appeared in several French papers and in the *Times*, *News*, *Star* and *Telegraph* in England. It was a most successful bit of propaganda. Coming as it did from General Scott, who had so recently "been practically a mem-

ber of the Federal Cabinet . . . it had an immediate and reassuring effect."

A few days later Scott sailed for New York to aid in the defense of the city in case of war with England. The propagandists decided that Archbishop Hughes should remain in France and interview the Emperor; and Bishop McIlvaine joined Weed in England. Weed sampled public opinion everywhere by dining assiduously with influential politicians, merchants, bankers, military officers; he studied the newspapers meticulously. Bishop McIlvaine was indefatigable in his conversations with the higher clergy; and busied himself in the labors of letter writing.

Charles Francis Adams was cordial to both Mr. Weed and Bishop McIlvaine. He promised to obtain an audience for Weed with Earl Russell and Lord Palmerston — an audience which might prive helpful in relieving English pressure over the *Trent* affair. However, an Englishman, McCullagh Torrens, succeeded in getting him an interview with Russell and Mr. Adams graciously allowed this impropriety. Weed went to Pembroke Lodge to lunch with Earl Russell. In his conversation Weed pointed out the British precedent of 1812, the seizing of British citizens from American ships; and that six thousand American seamen had been impressed before the United States resorted to war. Russell was not responsive. All in all the interview proved to be somewhat cold, embarrassing, and unsatisfactory to Weed. But before he left he learned from Lady Russell that Queen Victoria was anxious for an amicable settlement. Weed, assuming that Lady Russell's remarks had been inspired by the Earl, felt quite convinced now that the British Government would not force a war.

With the *Trent* excitement subsiding, a new threat arose. Both the British Parliament and the French Chamber of Deputies were giving serious consideration to breaking the Federal blockade of the Confederate States. The danger at the moment seemed greater in France than in England. Weed learned that the Emperor in his New Year's speech to the legislative chamber would demand the abrogation of the blockade. In a chance meeting with M. Loubat (which Weed called years afterward a "special intervention of an all-wise Providence"), an interview was arranged with the Duc de Morny, influential half-brother of Emperor Napoleon. Weed, in his own estimation was completely convincing in his arguments with the Duke, and when the Emperor's address was delivered there was no passage relating to the blockade.

Mr. Weed returned to the United States in June, 1862. Some estimate of Weed's success can be obtained from Seward's letter to Weed on March 7, 1862, "Everybody writes me that you have done everything well, and that your services have been extremely useful."

Archbishop Hughes spent some eight months abroad, and during that time he did his best to win from the French popular sentiment in favor of permitting the United States to solve her domestic problems without foreign interference. The archbishop secured a long conversation with the Emperor on December 24, 1861, and urged two courses of action: one was that the Emperor offer his services as mediator between England and America over the *Trent* affair; the other was to encourage France to raise cotton in Algeria and thus make herself independent of southern cotton. The Emperor declined to commit himself to the proposals, but it is not improbable that Hughes' statesman-like qualities were not without effect on the ultimate decision of Napoleon to remain neutral.

In Rome the archbishop enjoyed the favor of the Pope and his ministers, while in Ireland his personal magnetism carried him far and his speeches and conversations had a pronounced effect upon popular feelings. There can

be no doubt as to Hughes' ability to create sentiment for the Union cause in Rome and in Ireland, yet it is difficult to weigh exactly the precise influence he wielded. His role in the European countries was largely unobtrusive and his task not fully defined. President Lincoln, himself, paid a real tribute to Hughes in these words, "At a conjuncture of deep interest to the country, the Archbishop associated with others, went abroad and did the nation a service there with all the loyalty, fidelity, and practical wisdom which on so many other occasions illustrated his great ability for administration."

In the autumn of 1862 Thurlow Weed met Andrew Dickson White, a distinguished professor of history and literature in the University of Michigan, and urged him to go abroad and work for the Union. As a result of this, White in the spring of 1863 embarked for London and spent an active six months abroad diligently studying and influencing public sentiment. White admitted that in his travels he did find a few friends who espoused the Union cause. On a visit to Dublin he met John Elliot Cairnes, a political economist, whose writings definitely marked him as a friend to the North. Another person that White associated with was Professor William B. Carpenter, registrar of the University of London, who was anti-slavery and displayed a mildly favorable attitude toward the Union side. While in Germany, White became thoroughly acquainted with Consul-General William Walton Murphy of Michigan, an ardent American patriot, who had been successful in selling government bonds to Frankfort bankers.

Another effective authorized propagandist in England was Honorable Robert James Walker, former Secretary of the Treasury in 1845, and Governor of Kansas in 1857. A recognized authority on national finance (his Treasury report of 1845 had been widely read in England), he was sent abroad as an agent of the Treasury Department at Washington to maintain the credit of the North abroad; and to strike wherever possible at the "Confederate position in European financial circles." He was well known to European business men, bankers, and politicians, having made many important contacts abroad in 1851 and 1852 while negotiating an Illinois Central Railroad loan. Walker was well aware of the aversion of the English to slavery, and their dislike of the repudiation of financial obligations; and he made the most of these two factors in his propaganda theme. However, the procedures he used were not always of the highest ethical character.

Nevertheless, by the publication of pamphlets, timely propaganda, and personal interviews with people like Cobden, Bright, Forster, and Villiers, he struck at the credit abroad of the Confederate Government and succeeded in preventing the sale of much of the second issue of Confederate bonds, while at the same time selling approximately $250,000,000 of the Union 5-20 bonds. Two pamphlets by Walker linking slavery with repudiation were combined and published as a book in 1864 entitled, *American Slavery and Finances*, which even found its way into the pages of the London *Times*, the most influential financial journal in the world. To make certain of wider distribution of his writings the small and shrivelled up Walker even chartered a balloon and floated across England scattering his pamphlets.

Under instructions from the Navy Department, John M. Forbes and William Henry Aspinwall were sent abroad in March, 1863, for the purpose of preventing the sailing of the iron-clad rams then being constructed for the Confederacy at the yards of the Laird Brothers. For this purpose the gentlemen were provided with ten millions of 5-20 government bonds to purchase these privateers, if the ships could not be stopped legally. William H. Aspinwall had built the Panama railroad across the Isthmus and had helped found the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, while John M. Forbes was a

self-made man who had accumulated a great fortune in the China trade while in his early twenties and had built railroads — the Michigan Central, the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, and also the Hannibal and St. Joseph.

With Aspinwall and Forbes in London was William Evarts, an expert in maritime law who had been practicing before the prize courts in America. He had been sent as a State Department emissary to help in preparing the briefs Adams needed to stop Confederate ship construction. The mission of Forbes and Aspinwall was important and delicate; any indiscretion on their part could be disastrous, since Mr. Adams was busy denying the legality of the construction or sale of the vessels for or to either belligerent.

It did not require much time to convince Forbes and Aspinwall that the Confederate agents were sufficiently well stocked in funds to make it impossible for them to approach the Messrs. Laird with an offer for the rams. Accordingly they were forced to limit themselves to watching the effect of the legal proceedings initiated by Mr. Adams. It should be noted that Aspinwall, Forbes, and Evarts were special agents sent out by the departments of the government to accomplish objectives other than the diffusion of propaganda. Their policy of enlightenment in behalf of the Union cause was secondary, but nevertheless sincere and serious.

Men of vigorous action like Forbes and Aspinwall in spite of their discretion and caution could hardly escape suspicion. The pro-Confederate newspaper correspondents in New York got scent of their mission and did their utmost to make trouble. Minister Adams at this time was driven to active remonstrance and declared that, "ever since I have been here the almost constant interference of government agents of all kinds has had the effect, however intended, of weakening the position of the minister." Seward was unwilling to depend altogether on the traditional accredited representatives and through this "corps of international supernumeraries" he hoped to have his own private bureau of intelligence.

Unquestionably of all Americans in England during the War, none was more conspicuous than the Reverend Henry Ward Beecher, recognized leader of the anti-slavery forces. As America's most popular preacher he was an expert in the kind of oratory that would have a real appeal to the English middle and lower classes. He performed notable service by giving a series of speeches from October 9 to October 20, 1863, in Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and London before immense crowds. Beecher's opponents consisted of English hecklers, Southern sympathizers, and British patriots who remembered Beecher for his anti-British outbursts of a year or two before. However, Beecher thrived on taming the vociferous opposition of wild audiences, and was quick to turn adverse incidents to his own advantage.

Less conspicuous perhaps, but none the less important in aiding the Union cause abroad were other Americans like August Belmont, noted for his contacts with commercials and financial people in England and his correspondence with influential friends in Europe (especially Palmerston); Cyrus Field, who mixed among the people interested in his cable and whose letters to Bright, Russell, Gladstone, and the Duke of Argyll gave him considerable influence; and J. Pierpont Morgan, who was made an agent to secure a loan not so much for the money to be obtained as to enlist the interest of the capitalists; and Robert Dale Owen, who was commissioned to purchase arms in Europe for the state troops of Indiana between May, 1861, and February, 1863.

The attitude of Britain was a great factor in the American Civil War. In all diplomatic maneuvers, both official and non-official, there ran the main

question of recognition of the Confederacy, and the related questions of mediation, active intervention, breaking the blockade, and the demands for an armistice. If the South had won any of these points, victory would have been well within her grasp. To what do we attribute this failure?

It has been attributed to a number of things, the diversion of British diplomatic attention, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, renewed English economic profits, and the diplomacy of Charles Francis Adams. It must be recognized, however, that the best hopes of the South in rushing the British government off its feet. But Lord Palmerston and Earl Russell were prudent and moderate. To them and to the "realistic solidity" of British opinion which they interpreted must be attached considerable importance.

The question of how important a part the activities of "Lincoln's Good-Will Ambassadors" played in formulating, strengthening, and maintaining this "realistic solidity" of British opinion remains unanswered. Because of the paucity of the records concerning their activities a precise evaluation of their activities is precluded. At most we can conjecture and resign ourselves to agree with Mr. Channing, "Whether their activities were helpful or otherwise was a matter of opinion."

BOOKS

Since in a divided world American strength lies as much in our democratic heritage as in our superior technology and physical force, the social studies teacher has a duty to re-examine the intellectual basis of this heritage. In this task the teacher will find help in *Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought*, by David Spitz (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949, $4.50). This book presents, discusses, and refutes the arguments of several American critics of democracy. Separate chapters are devoted to James Burnham, Lawrence Dennis, Ralph Adams Cram, Madison Grant, E. M. Sait, George Santayana, and Irving Babbitt, with incidental reference to T. S. Eliot, Paul Elmer Moore, Henry and Brooks Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and others. These men's ideas are in turn related to European political thought from Plato to Pareto and to recent findings in the fields of anthropology, sociology, and eugenics.

Spitz points out that many of the critics of democracy fall into error simply because they do not understand its essential features. These he defines as "the free play of conflicting opinions" and "the responsibility of the rulers to the ruled." His book abounds in suggestive ideas as to what democracy is and what it is not.

Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought is so good that one could wish it were more readable. The author is at too much pains to display erudition, as when he lists no fewer than twenty-five men who have maintained that democracy means the rule of the worst. The style is cumbersome, too often larded with latinisms such as "perdure" and "ineluctable" where simpler words would serve to express the sense. The organization is repetitious. After the third or fourth anti-democrat has been presented, tried, and found mistaken the reader tires of the proceedings: it is like a succession of old-time melodramas in which vice always seems to be about to triumph when the hero arrives just in time to save the heroine from a fate worse than death and to dispatch the villain with a few well-aimed generalizations. Finally, it seems extreme to devote so much print to such a discredited figure as James Burnham, who predicted in 1941 that there would never again be a free election to the United States presidency, or to such a forgotten figure

(as an essayist if not as an architect) as Ralph Adams Cram, who once espoused the cause of the Stuart Pretenders. Spitz's genuine insight into the nature of democracy and the fallacies of its detractors would be better displayed if he devoted less time to flogging dead horses.

In spite of its defects, however, this book deserves a place in a social studies library. Not only is it valuable because of its summary of attacks on democracy with accompanying counter-arguments, but also it is a gold mine of references and useful quotations.

David J. Dallin's *The Rise of Russia in Asia* (Yale, 1949, 285 pages, $5.00) is the scholarly analysis of Russia's Eastern policy between 1850 and 1931. Though published a year later, it is the companion volume to the same author's *Soviet Russia in the Far East*, which has already carried the story from 1931 down to the present.

Dallin's thesis is that the Russian Asiatic policy, both Czarist and Soviet, has been consistently anti-British. Amidst a maze of shifting Russian attitudes toward Germany, Japan, China, and the other Far Eastern powers Dallin points out the steady Anglophobia behind every change. He believes, for example, that Russia supported the Kuomintang between 1923 and 1927 because it was hoped that "the integration of the Orient into a great war against Britain" would follow. A wealth of parallels between the past and the present appear in this work, but Dallin does not succumb to the temptation of assuming that all is now being repeated. He feels that the Communist ideology and the lack of a strong Asiatic power comparable to Russia both make the situation today far different from that in the past. Even though Dallin's book will help the reader better understand the cold war in the East, it makes no pretense at providing him with the answers.

Though little fault can be found with the material Dallin presents, there are two possible criticisms to make of some he has neglected. In the first place he completely overlooks the Russian drive into the Amur Valley in Asia between 1650 and 1690, and in so doing plunges into the nineteenth century without sufficient introduction. He secondly fails to explain adequately the pendulum-like pattern of Russia's foreign policy in Europe and Asia, which has led Russia to alternate Western aggression and Eastern expansion. Though he does mention the shift in emphasis about 1920, he neglects it in the nineteenth century, when Western frustration turned Russia toward Eastern aggrandizement and vice versa.

Aside from these minor considerations, however, this is a timely, clearly written, and well-documented book. It will reward the student of the Far East and the general reader alike.

John Gunther's latest inside report, *Behind the Curtain* (Harper & Brothers, 1949, 363 pages including index, $3.00) presents some very interesting sidelights concerning an area of which many teachers and students talk, but of which few have acquired much factual knowledge. The author surveys a broad sector of eastern Europe at a breathless pace, but despite many unavoidable generalizations and perhaps a paucity of historical background, many challenging issues and questions are raised.

Gunther's analysis of the countries of eastern Europe reminds one forcibly of their disparate nationalities, and most readers will find his account of Communist schismatics, particularly Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia,

both informative and stimulating. No automatic schemes for the salvation of Russo-American relations are proffered, but the book is in fact, as it purposes to be, a semi-journalistic description.

If the reader is occasionally depressed by the staccato style and the breathless pace, he will nevertheless find Gunther a past master at unusual anecdotes and the creation of mood. This is the kind of a book dealing with contemporary affairs which has enough meat in it and a sufficient novelty and freshness in approach to appeal to the average high school student. It could well form the basis of classroom discussion, of preparation for talks or debates, or perhaps serve for the teacher who wants to brush up on some of the world's more vital areas in a painless fashion.

Students as well as teachers with an interest in maritime New England History would do well to dip into George S. Wasson's *Sailing Days on the Penobscot* (W. W. Norton Co., N. Y., 1949, $4.00). This book is a new edition of a work which appeared in 1932, and is crammed with the factual history of the former Penobscot Bay ports down through the first World War, as well as presenting a wealth of fascinating minutiae and an abundance of salty anecdotes.

The reader, unless he is up on his maritime history, may be surprised at the amount and flourishing status of trade in such river ports as Bangor during the nineteenth century, and no one but a confirmed landlubber can fail to enjoy the description of the unique civilization of Isle au Haut. In many respects the book in a broader sense represents an epic tale of the rise and decline not only of commerce along the Maine coast but above all the art of shipbuilding. Indeed the book closes with an impressive and tragic epitaph on a vanished era with the description of the failure of Maine shipbuilders to revive their lost craftsmanship during and immediately after the first World War.

For the general reader descriptions of sailing craft, particularly the detailed account of "The Vanished Pinky," may seem unnecessarily long and uncomprehensible, and the late Mr. Wasson might well be criticized for failing to integrate the maritime history of the Penobscot region with events along the coast and widespread historical and economic movements elsewhere. For its particular field, however, the book is authoritative and well documented with statistics, index, and some delightful old prints and photographs. For those who love the smell of salt air and the tang of down east dialect, this book should provide some very pleasant and informative hours.

Granger Country, Lloyd Lewis and Stanley Padgellis, editors, (Little Brown and Co., 1949, $5.00). This excellent collection of pictures is a history of two developments: first, the settlement and economic development of the Granger country: secondly, a picture by picture narrative of railroading as a local line, established in 1849, gradually emerges as the Burlington System of today.

Many of the earlier pictures and cartoons are taken from drawings in such magazines as *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* or *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*. Some of the best photographs of the period, 1870-1890, come from the Nebraska Historical Association collection and from the Burlington's own archives. How these early railroads mastered the Great Plans, how the immigrants travelled to these new lands, sod houses, farmers fighting grasshoppers, the early cow towns, revival meetings, the Granger mass meetings to curb railroad evils — all are pictured.

At the same time the pictures trace the changes in railroading from the

early locomotives, pullmans, cattle cars, and mail carriages to the modern Streamliner of today with its Diesel engines and dome-topped, passenger coaches. The problems of the early brakemen in stopping freight cars before the advent of the airbrake or in dealing with the "tramp problem" are told with interest and humor. Other pictures portray key industries and products in the fourteen states which the Burlington serves.

Recommended to teachers in the Junior High and High Schools as a stimulating aid to the study of the Middle West in both history and geography classes.

History of Europe, C. J. H. Hayes, M. H. Baldwin, and C. W. Cole. The MacMillan Co, New York, 1949, $5.00.

This textbook is designed to fulfill the needs of college survey courses. As far as any authors could manage to tell the story of western civilization from the pyramids to the present, to make sense, and to keep their scholarly integrity the three distinguished scholars collaborating on this textbook have achieved their purpose. The question that must arise, however, is whether the survey course typified by the recently abandoned History 1 at Harvard is not outdated. Few, if any students, can cover so much of the past in so short a time as a single academic year and derive from the experience much but tags and bits of knowledge and canned generalizations. The quarrel of this reviewer is with the type of course which this book is designed to serve rather than with the text itself.

This *History of Europe* is, however, one which can be of great usefulness to secondary school teachers, not as a textbook for students but as a refresher course for themselves. Here, in brief, are the essential generalizations of scholars about the entire history of western civilization; the present reviewer has derived both pleasure and illumination from assessing his own historical baggage in the light of this readable and well-organized compendium. The maps are excellent and the many illustrations are for the most part tied in with the text.

HENRY W. BRAGDON
DONALD B. COLE
COLIN F. N. IRVING
PHILLIPS E. WILSON

Of some interest to social studies teachers is an attractive history of the first four years of the United Nations in pamphlet form. It is illustrated and is arranged on a topical basis. The price is twenty-five cents and copies can be obtained from International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y.

The Minneapolis Star has available to educators without charge a Program of Information on World Affairs consisting of a Guide with outlines and references and an optional series of weekly tests. Twenty-six topics are covered, all of current interest, and Dr. Edgar B. Wesley will serve as adviser and counselor to the program. For complete information write World Affairs, Minneapolis Star, Minneapolis 15, Minn.